

REMARKS

Claims 1-19 are pending in the current application. Claim 11 is currently amended.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 4 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Huang et al. (US 6,041,358, hereinafter “Huang I”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Applicants respectfully submit Huang fails to teach “transmitting a message to the dependent indicating to the dependent to register with a communications network using a frequency band $f_{\text{band}(2)}$ ” as claim 1 recites. With respect to claim 1, the Examiner cites Col. 9, lines 45-63 of Huang I, which describe a handoff process between a mobile MT and two base stations BS. Huang I describes a process whereby when the MT leaves the proximity of a first BS and enters the proximity of a second BS: 1) the MT sends a packet to the first BS, 2) the first BS deregisters the MT, 3) the MT sends a packet to the second BS, 4) and the second BS registers the MT. The Examiner appears to read the master device recited in claim 1 on the first BS, and the dependent recited in claim 1 on the MT. However, under this interpretation, Huang I fails to teach “transmitting a message to the dependent indicating to the dependent to register with a communications network”, as claim 1 recites, because Huang I does not teach sending a message **to the MT** indicating the MT to register with a communications network.

Alternatively, if the Examiner is reading the master device recited in claim 1 on the MT and the dependent recited in claim 1 on the BS, Huang I still fails to teach the aforementioned limitation of claim 1 because Huang I only teaches sending a message to the first BS, to which the first BS responds by deregistering the MT. Huang I does

not teach sending a message to the first BS indicating the first BS to **register with a communications network**. Accordingly, Huang I fails to teach each of the elements of claim 1 as is required to support a rejection under §102.

Additionally, claims 3, 4 and 8 each depend from claim 1. Accordingly, at least by virtue of their dependence from claim 1, Huang I fails to teach each of the elements in any of claims 3, 4 and 8 as is required to support a rejection under §102.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 1-3, 4 and 8 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5-7 and 9-10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang I in view of Farwell et al. (US 5,396,541, hereinafter "Farwell").

The deficiencies of Huang I are discussed above and are relevant here as well because claims 5-7 and 9-10 depend from claim 1. For at least the reasons stated above, Huang I fails to teach each of the elements in claim 1. As is readily apparent, Farwell fails to remedy this deficiency. Accordingly, neither Huang I, nor Farwell, alone or in combination teach each of the limitations of claim 1. Consequently, at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 1, neither Huang I, nor Farwell, alone or in combination, teach each of the limitations in any of claims 5-7 and 9-10 as is required to support a rejection under §103.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 5-7 and 9-10 under §103 be withdrawn.

Claims 11-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang (US 5,448,569, hereinafter "Huang II") in view of Stewart (US 5,633,888, hereinafter "Stewart"). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

With respect to claim 11, Applicants respectfully submit neither Stewart nor Huang II, alone or in combination, teach "registering a dependent with one of (1) the controller and (2) a second master device and the controller if the dependent detects a signal transmitted on a second frequency hopping sequence" where the signal has "a higher signal strength than a signal transmitted on the first frequency hopping sequence".

With respect to Huang II, the Examiner admits Huang II fails to teach the aforementioned limitation from claim 11 (July 21, 2008 Office Action: p. 7). With respect to Stewart, Applicants note the Examiner appears to read the 'dependent' in claim 11 on the 'mobile device' in Stewart. Stewart teaches a process whereby, once a received signal strength for a mobile device drops below a given threshold, the mobile chooses an access point to switch to based on which access point has the highest '**adjacency value**' (Stewart col. 10, ln. 15-20). The mobile determines which access point has the highest adjacency value based on an 'adjacency matrix', which is transmitted to the mobile device from an access point and stored in the memory of the mobile device (Stewart col. 7, ln. 1-12). Stewart does not teach an adjacency value being equivalent to a detected signal strength. Accordingly, Stewart teaches a process whereby a mobile device switches to an access point having a highest **adjacency value**, not a higher **signal strength** as claim 1 requires. Further, Stewart teaches switching access points **when a current signal drops below a threshold**

value, not if a frequency hopping sequence having a higher signal strength is detected as claim 11 requires. Accordingly, neither Huang, nor Stewart, alone or in combination, teach each of the limitations of claim 11 as is required to support a rejection under §103.

With respect to claim 18, the Examiner asserts claim 18 is rejected for the same reasons as claim 11. However, in the Examiner's discussion of claim 11, the Examiner failed to identify anything in Huang II or Stewart that teaches "transmitting an unregistration message over the second frequency hopping sequence if the strength of the first frequency hopping sequence falls below a threshold value" as claim 18 recites. Accordingly, at least for this reason, neither Huang II, nor Stewart, alone or in combination, teach each of the limitations in claim 18 as is required to support a rejection under §103.

Additionally claims 12-17 depend from claim 11, and claim 19 depends from claim 18. Accordingly, at least by virtue of their dependence from claims 11 and 18, neither Huang II, nor Stewart, alone or in combination, teach each of the limitations in any of claims 12-17 as is required to support a rejection under §103.

Therefore, Applicants respectfully request the rejection of claims 11-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Accordingly, in view of the above amendments and remarks, reconsideration of the objections and rejections and allowance of each of claims 1-19 in connection with the present application is earnestly solicited.


Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Gary D. Yacura at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 or under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

HARNESS, DICKY, & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By



Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416

P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

JHA
GDY/JHA: tlt